

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings regarding missing references numbers.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's attention to this detail and thank Examiner for pointing out that the reference number 66 is not described in the specification. Applicants have amended page 18 of the specification to add reference number 66 to the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that reference numbers 62 and 64 are also referenced in this paragraph.

Applicants respectfully submit that reference number 36 may be found in the upper left corner of Figure 1, referencing the oval entitled "Directives." Applicants also submit that what the Examiner has identified as reference number "63" and "1" are actually drawing elements illustrating operands "63" and "1" in a syntax tree formation. This can be seen on the first line of Figure 2(b) where the statement that is illustrate in Figure 2(c) appears as "pc_filter = rand(63,1)."

The Examiner has also indicated that the trademark MATLAB™ is used in this application. The applicants respect the proprietary nature of trademarks and as such have amended the specification as indicated above to note the use of the trademark MATLAB™ and have included the trademark owner's name and address in the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the use of the MATLAB trademark in this application is proper.

Claims 1-17 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Official Action dated February 5, 2003, claims 1-17 were rejected as anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,226,776, issued to Panchul, et al. on May 1, 2001 ("Panchul"). Applicants herein cancel, without prejudice, claims 1-17. Applicants herein add claims 18-38. Applicants now request consideration and allowance of claims 18-38.

In order to expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicants note some of the distinctions of the pending claims with the cited references. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentably distinct over Panchul. New claim 18 recites a method for compiling a functional description by, “receiving the functional description expressed in the *interpretive* algorithmic language with at least one *undeclared variable*....” (Emphasis added). Conversely, Panchul discloses a system for compiling C into a register transfer level format. Col. 13, lns. 12-42. However, C is not interpretive. C is a compiled language wherein variables must be declared prior to compilation. Therefore, the element “receiving a functional description expressed in the interpretive, algorithmic language with at least one undeclared variable” is missing from Panchul.

Moreover, new claim 18 also recites other novel elements not disclosed in Panchul. For example, new claim 18 recites, “assigning a type and a dimension to the *at least one undeclared variable*.” (Emphasis added). Panchul discloses a system that accepts, as a starting point, a C language program. As discussed above, in the C language, variables are declared prior to compilation. Because variables are predeclared, there is no need to assign a type and a dimension to variables. Therefore, this element is also missing from Panchul.

Other new claims contain novel element not disclosed in Panchul. For example, new claim 26 recites, “a parser for receiving the functional description expressed in the *interpretive*, algorithmic language with *at least one undeclared variable*,” and “a *type-shape analyzer*, coupled to the parser, for assigning *a type and a dimension* to the *at least one undeclared variable*.” (Emphasis added). Similarly, new claim 34 recites, “receiving the functional description expressed in the interpretive, algorithmic language with at least one undeclared variable,” and “assigning a type and dimension to the *at least one undeclared variable* by

analyzing the functional description to form an abstract syntax tree.” (Emphasis added). For the reasons discussed above, these elements are not disclosed by Panchul. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 18-38 are patentably distinct from Panchul.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18-38 as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request consideration and allowance of these claims.

Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
Prithviraj Banerjee, Alok Choudhary, Malay
Haldar, & Anshuman Nayak

Date: 08/04/03

By: Deepti Panchawagh-Jain

Deepti Panchawagh-Jain, Esq.
Registration No. 43,846
3039 Calle De Las Estrella
San Jose, CA 95148
(408) 506-5352 (Phone)
(801) 838-1085 (Fax)